

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

CONFIRMATION

From the:
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Shook Lin & Bok
1 Robinson Road
#18-00 AIA Tower
048542 Singapore

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) 4 MAY 2004Applicant's or agent's file reference
2032348-slbFOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/SG2004/000010

International filing date (day/month/year)

9 January 2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

9 January 2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

A. Cl. 7 H04B 7/00

Applicant

CET TECHNOLOGIES PTE LTD et al

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU

AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE
PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: pct@ipaustalia.gov.au
Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929

Authorized Officer

MICHAEL VALENTINE
Telephone No. (02) 6283 2797

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/SG2004/000010

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/SG2004/000010

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 21	YES
	Claims 1-20, 22-23	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	YES
	Claims 1-23	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-23	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The International Search Report completed by the Australian Patent Office on 29 April 2004 identified the following documents as relevant.

D1 : US 2003/0207694 A1

D2 : DE 29820552 U1

D3 : US 6311052 B1

Claims 1-23 are directed toward a wireless communication system in which a client unit can listen to multiple radio channels concurrently.

Claims 1-20 and 22-23 are not novel in light of D1 which discloses said claims.

These claims also lack an inventive step in light of the disclosure of D1.

Claims 1-20 and 22 are not novel in light of the disclosure of D2 which discloses all features of said claims. Claim 23 of the present application adds the feature of a headset however these are well known in the art as can be seen from D3. Thus claim 23 lacks an inventive step in light of either D2 with common general knowledge or the disclosures of D2 and D3 when combined as would be obvious to a person skilled in the art.

Claim 21 is not explicitly disclosed in any of the listed documents. It is considered that bluetooth is an obvious choice of protocol for wireless communication and thus claim 21 lacks an inventive step in light of either of D1 or D2 when combined with common general knowledge in the art of radio communication.

Claims 1-23 find industrial applicability in the field of radio communications.